DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 890 JC 860 047

AUTHOR Byrd, Ann Marie
TITLE Four Dimensions of Staff Development Activities as Related to Part-Time Community College Instructors' Needs, Awareness, and Levels of Participation.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY Florida Association of Staff and Program Development.
PUB DATE Jul 85
NOTE 64p.; Based on a dissertation completed at the University of Florida.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Community Colleges; *Faculty Development; Inservice Education; Needs Assessment; *Part Time Faculty; *Professional Development; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Participation; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to analyze four dimensions of community college staff development activities (i.e., instructional, personal, professional and organizational) as related to part-time instructors' needs, awareness, and participation. Study findings, based on a telephone survey of staff development officers in Florida, a survey of 262 part-time instructors at three Florida community colleges, and a survey of the staff development directors of the three institutions, included the following: (1) only one of the three colleges offered training for part-time faculty in all four developmental areas; (2) although respondents indicated that the training they had received was useful to them, they also identified current needs for training that were not being met; (3) "training in the latest instructional trends" was considered the most needed by faculty; (4) at one institution, "training in student development needs" had the least amount of participation (4.7%), yet showed the highest amount of need (63.9%); and (5) at one institution, over 50% of the part-time instructors expressed a need for training activities in areas that were considered of little use by the staff development director. The survey instrument is appended. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. L. WATTENBARGER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED265890

JC 860 047

FOUR DIMENSIONS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES AS RELATED TO PART-TIME COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS' NEEDS, AWARENESS, AND LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION

by

ANN MARIE BYRD

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

INSTITUTE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA

1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
FOREWORD		iii
PART I	PART-TIME COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES	1
	Introduction	1
	Faculty Development	6
	Florida's Community College Staff Development Program	9
	Staff Development Program Criteria	10
PART II	THE STUDY	12
	METHODOLOGY	13
	RESULTS	18
	Conclusions and Discussion	40
	Recommendations	46
	Implications	47
APPENDIX A - INSTRUMENT FOR PART-TIME INSTRUCTORS		49
APPENDIX B - INSTRUMENT FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT DIRECTORS		53
REFERENCES		57

FOREWORD

The Institute of Higher Education is pleased upon occasion to provide summary presentations of dissertations which are thereby made available for distribution to a larger number of professional persons. This monograph is a part of that series.

The dilemmas caused by the wide use of part-time faculty are well known. The minimal attention given to providing opportunity for in-service development to part-time faculty has been recognized and a way of correcting that omission is the major topic of Byrd's study.

In this study she demonstrates how a community college may devise an outstanding and valued program for part-time faculty development and how such a program can be built around the identified and perceived needs of the part-time faculty. This report, however, presents no easy answers to complicated questions.

Any community college that uses the questionnaire and the procedures outlined by Dr. Byrd will find its part-time faculty much better qualified and much more capable. Permission to use materials included here is granted to any community college which wants to provide such a program.

Materials developed by Hekimian in a previous publication of the IHE ("Criteria for the Institutional Evaluation of Community College Staff Development

Programs") will provide a broader base of institutional evaluation of which part-time faculty development is one part.

The IHE is most appreciative of help and support from the Florida Association of Staff and Program Development. The FASPD was a major factor in making this publication available for distribution.

James L. Wattenbarger, Director
Institute of Higher Education

Gainesville, Florida
July, 1985

PART I

PART-TIME COMMUNITY COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Introduction

Employment of part-time instructors in community colleges represents a double-edged sword. Part-timers are cost-effective because they accept lower salaries and receive few of the benefits that full-time faculty have. They offer program flexibility. Credit and noncredit courses may be added or deleted as the need dictates, simply by hiring or releasing part-time instructors. In times of budgetary uncertainty, institutions find themselves increasingly guided by this attractive alternative, the part-time instructor.

The other edge of the sword is academic quality. Can part-time instructors maintain the same standards of quality as full-time faculty who are encouraged to stay current in their fields through a variety of faculty development activities? Bender and Hammons (1972) claimed that "part-timers bring something new to the classroom--a breath of the real world, in the form of day-to-day experience in business, industry, government, or other educational experiences" (p. 21). Hoenniger and Black (1978) cautioned that growing numbers of students are

taught by part-time instructors and quality control is an issue of concern. Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne (1982) noted that

> there are nagging questions in the minds of those who must decide how to staff. Quality control is one of the most significant. Secondly, there are significant questions about the continuity and substance of academic programs that lack a core of full-time faculty. Remaining flexible is one thing, but failing to develop and maintain skilled, knowledgeable, and committed faculty can in the long run, only hurt an institution's stability and competence. (p. 5)

Friedlander (1980) called attention to the impact community college part-time instructors have on program quality:

> If, as it is commonly assumed, certain factors (academic degree attainment, teaching experience, continuity of employment, knowledge of one's educational environment, use of instructional technologies, involvement in educational policy decisions, maintenance of office hours, interaction with colleagues, and participation professional development activities) contribute to program effectiveness, then one could conclude that the quality of instruction provided by a college is likely to be adversely affected as the proportion of part-time to full-time faculty increases. (p. 35)

Turner (1979) stated that the heavy use of part-time instructors produces inadequate commitment to curriculum construction, evaluation, coordination and projection, thereby reducing overall program effectiveness (p. 37). Tuckman and Caldwell (1979) added that those institutions that lack clearly-defined skill levels and appropriate incentive systems may be faced with declining educational quality (p. 759).

The report of the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (1984) noted that part-time faculty in colleges and universities increased from 23 percent in 1966 to 41 percent in 1980. The study group cautioned that "the higher the proportion of part-time faculty, the more difficult it becomes to maintain collegiality, to assure continuity in the instructional program, and to preserve coherence in the curriculum" (p. 37). One of the recommendations put forth in this report was the consolidation of as many part-time teaching lines into full-time positions as possible. Part-time instructors, the authors explained, generally have difficulty in making a primary commitment to identification with the institution and involvement with the students. As an investment, full-time instructors are more profitable because of their contributions to the total educational environment. Part-time instructors typically provide only services for which they are contracted namely, instruction within the classroom.

The literature on part-time instructors reveals several general themes such as the differences between part-timers and full-timers, the vast numbers of part-time faculty, and the dearth of research and programs conducted in the area of faculty development. Studies have been conducted which examined differences between part-time and full-time faculty. Seitz (1972) concluded that part-time faculty

were less prepared for teaching, held a less favorable attitude toward the institution, were less committed to their institution and less knowledgeable about their educational environment. He recommended improved employment and in-service training practices for part-time faculty. Research by Cohen and Brawer (1977) revealed that part-time instructors were less experienced, less committed to their institution, less likely to be a member of a professional association, less concerned with research, less committed to curriculum and instruction, and less concerned with the humanities (pp. 60-61). Friedlander's (1980) research supported the findings of Cohen and Brawer. Studies conducted by Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne (1982) noted the wide variation in quality of instruction among part-time instructors. They labeled part-time instructors marginal members of academia because of their isolation from the benefits that come from full-time membership within the academic community.

Part-time instructors remain a cornerstone of the community college concept. Because of their willingness to work at odd times in unusual locations, they serve as a vehicle for responding to the educational needs of the community and provide flexibility to these programs. During the period between 1977 and 1983, part-time instructors in public community colleges increased by 122 percent. Part-time faculty made up 56.6 percent of the

instructional force in public community colleges in 1983 (AACJC, 1978, 1984). They are vital to the community college, which has been called "the people's college" because of its accessibility and flexibility. Mushrooming enrollments in the 1970s meant that faculty, whether full-time or part-time, were expected to develop an appreciation for change, for innovation, and for nontraditional students. This expectation prompted the growth of staff development programs.

Community college students come from diverse social and economic backgrounds. This diversity also became a hallmark of the faculty as their numbers accelerated. Heterogeneity has remained evident in the faculty as well as the students. Despite the continued swelling of their ranks, however, part-time instructors are often overlooked. Smith (1980) maintained that inaccurate awareness of part-time instructors' needs has contributed to the lack of response to this sizeable cohort.

In their book Part-Time Faculty in American Higher Education, Leslie, Kellams, and Gunne (1982) found few statistics available on part-time instructors. They noted that the National Center for Educational Statistics does not compile part-time data on a routine basis, and the reports of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) are not based on periodic annual surveys. Additionally, the National Science Foundation's studies of

scientific faculty exclude faculty in a variety of humanistic and professional fields, where the use of part-timers is especially heavy (p. 15). Pedras (1984) noted the paucity of research literature dealing with the in-service needs of part-time community college faculty prior to 1975 (p 12).

Developmental assistance for part-time instructors has been sketchy, although interest has increased in the last two decades. More often than not, however, part-time instructors do not fit into an institution's developmental scheme. As a result, they often lack an understanding of the community college philosophy, their students, course syllabi, and available alternatives (Smith, 1980, p. 18).

Faculty Development

While four-year colleges and universities turned to faculty development as a response to declining enrollments, decreasing resources, and low faculty mobility in the 1970s, community colleges embraced the concept for other reasons. During that time, the number of community college students and faculty rose dramatically. Concern for staff development programs also grew. Although some writers requested that more attention be paid to part-time instructors, little was done.

The heavy enrollment increases, unprecedented growth, and rapid program development created the demand for community college faculty to stay current in a time of

change. In 1972 the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) designated staff development as a priority item to be addressed. O'Banion (1974), a contributing writer to the Report of the 1973 Assembly of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges on staff development, stated that "the priority of the future is a priority of persons, on the needs of the people who staff the people's college" (p. 25).

The scope of staff development programs began to expand in the 1970s. Not only were instructional needs being addressed, but also personal, professional, and organizational needs. Instructional development focused on the curriculum, personal development concentrated on individual growth, professional development sought to improve instructional competencies, and organizational development promoted an effective work environment.

The surge of interest in staff development in the mid-70s also included part-time instructors, but their involvement was considerably less than that of full-time faculty. Centra's (1976) national survey revealed that over half of the postsecondary institutions in the U.S. provided faculty development activities. Smith (1981) in part replicated Centra's study with his research on staff development goals and activities of U.S. community colleges. He found that staff development goals related more to full-time faculty than to part-timers; he

recommended that a variety of staff development activities be offered for all staff and that additional research be conducted to determine participant perceptions of the usefulness of staff development. Hammons (1973) noted the need for a systematic program of pre-service and in-service training for part-time instructors if their talents were to be fully utilized. Lombardi (1975) echoed this by declaring that the lack of staff development programs for part-time faculty was a critical problem in community colleges (p. 18).

Black (1981) found significant differences in the perceptions of deans, directors of continuing education, department chairs, and part-time faculty regarding the instructional needs of part-time faculty. She recommended further study on ways to improve communication between groups studied, and ways to provide improved assistance to part-time faculty. Several authors have suggested strategies and developed models for the development of part-time instructors (Behm, Lybarger, Toole & Wilbur, 1977; Elioff, Whitmore, & Bagwell, 1981; Hammons, 1973; Moe, 1977; Pedras, 1984; Pierce & Miller, 1980).

Over the past two decades, educational writers have recommended that part-time faculty members be a vital part of the staff development program. Instructional, personal, professional, and organizational needs have been identified. Models have been designed, pleas made,

research statistics presented, but part-timers still are not in the mainstream of staff development activities (Hammons, 1981; Lombardi, 1975; Russell, 1980; Smith, 1981; Weichenthal, Means & Kozoll, 1977).

Florida's Community College Staff Development Program

In 1968 the Florida Legislature established a plan to provide staff and program development within community colleges. These programs were to focus on the personal and professional development of all college employees.

Part-time instructors made up 62 percent of the Florida community college faculty in 1983 (AACJC, 1984). Their considerable size and responsibility demanded attention. On April 6, 1984, with the recommendation of the Council of Presidents, the State Board of Community Colleges approved seven standards for Florida's twenty-eight community colleges to assure quality selection and performance of part-time faculty. The Board stated the following:

1. Academic credentials required for part-time faculty shall be the same as for full-time faculty.
2. Part-time faculty shall attend orientation sessions.
3. Part-time faculty policy and procedure handbooks shall be provided.
4. Part-time faculty shall participate in inservice training.
5. Part-time faculty shall attend and participate in college department and curriculum meetings.
6. Part-time faculty shall be evaluated formally annually.
7. Part-time faculty shall meet with students for academic advising and counseling. (State Board of Community Colleges, 1984)

In light of these standards, especially 2 and 4, staff development programs should prove to be an important vehicle in quality assurance.

Staff Development Program Criteria

In 1984 Hekimian identified and validated criteria for instructional evaluation of staff development programs with special reference to Florida public community colleges. To facilitate evaluation, she developed criteria from the literature on which to evaluate staff development programs. Selected criteria from Hekimian's instrument were used in this study to examine staff development activities as they pertain to part-time instructors.

Portions of Hekimian's (1984) evaluative criteria were derived from the writings of Gaff (1975), and Bergquist and Phillips (1975). Gaff's research led him to identify three approaches to development: faculty development, instructional development,and organizational development. Faculty development promoted individual growth and development. Instructional development dealt with courses or curricula. Organizational development sought to create an effective teaching and learning environment (pp. 8, 10).

Bergquist and Phillips (1975) developed a comprehensive model for faculty development that encompassed instructional, organizational, and personal development. Instructional development focused on teaching, learning, content, and environment. Organizational development focused on team-building, decision-making, conflict

management, and managerial training. Personal development included life planning, personal growth, and supportive and therapeutic counseling. Drawing from these writings, Hekimian (1984) developed instructional, personal, professional and organizational development criteria within her evaluative instrument.

All of the criteria developed by Hekimian (1984) in her study are not absolutely essential for an institution's staff development program. Her criteria were developed to provide "a foundation for evaluation as determined by an institution's individual needs" (Hekimian, 1984, p. 140). In the same spirit, the selected criteria from Hekimian's study that were used in this research offer a broad framework for examining staff development programs. The comprehensiveness and effectiveness of any program rests with each institution.

Part-time instructors represent a large component of the faculty teaching at community colleges. They are rarely addressed through research, and they have little tendency or opportunity to participate in faculty development programs. The increased use of part-time instructors has focused attention on the quality of education which they provide. The State of Florida has taken steps to maintain high standards of quality and accountability regarding these faculty members. Faculty development programs are seen by some educational writers to be an effective response to quality assurance.

PART II

THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to examine and analyze four dimensions of staff development activities as related to part-time instructors' perceived needs, awareness of staff development offerings, and levels of participation in staff development activities. The four dimensions of the staff development activities considered in this study were instructional, personal, professional, and organizational. Specifically, the problem addressed the following questions:

1. Were there differences between the available staff development training areas identified by staff development directors, and selected evaluative criteria developed by Hekimian?
2. Was there a relationship between the staff development needs of part-time instructors and the staff development training areas available to them?
3. Was there a relationship between the perceived needs of the part-time instructors and their levels of participation in the staff development training areas?
4. Was there a relationship between part-time instructors' awareness of staff development training areas and their levels of participation?
5. Were there differences between staff development

training areas that part-time faculty believed were available to them and those training areas that actually were available to them, as indicated by staff development directors?

6. Was there a relationship between the perceptions of part-time faculty and staff development directors regarding the staff development needs of part-time instructors?
7. Was there a relationship between the perceived needs of the part-time instructors and their years of teaching experience?
8. Was there a relationship between the perceived needs of the part-time instructors and their subject areas?

METHODOLOGY

This research study started with a telephone survey of the staff development officers at the 28 community colleges in Florida. They were questioned on the availability and comprehensiveness of staff development activities for their part-time instructors. The survey revealed a lack of uniformity among the institutions in offering staff development activities to part-time instructors. While some institutions made staff development activities available to their part-time instructors, other institutions offered no activities at all to this group. A few directors believed that changes would occur over the

next year as a result of the stance taken by Florida's State Board for Community Colleges. In April 1984 the Board approved statewide standards for community colleges to strengthen the selection and performance of part-time instructors. Standard Four states: "Part-time faculty shall participate in inservice training." The responses further indicated a need for this study, especially in this period of compliance resulting from the Board's recommendations.

The criteria used in the questionnaire were selected from among those developed by Hekimian (1984) for the institutional evaluation of community college staff development programs. In Hekimian's category of Program Implementation were 10 subcategories. Four of these 10 were identified as having direct implications for part-time instructors. They were Instructional Development Activities, Personal Development Activities, Professional Development Activities, and Organizational Development Activities. Hekimian further identified 19 specific training areas within these 4 developmental activities. These 19 training areas composed the core of the questionnaire.

Instructional Development

1. Training in the latest instructional trends
2. Training in the development of course objective and course design

3. Training in remedial and developmental techniques of instruction

4. Training in student self-instructional methods

5. Training in multimedia approaches to instruction

6. Training in the evaluation of instructional strategies

Personal Development

7. Training in interpersonal skills, i.e., skills for dealing with others

8. Training in personal growth and development

9. Professional growth contracts, i.e., agreements by which faculty receive feedback on specified areas of instruction

10. Individual counseling

11. Training in health awareness

Professional Development

12. Training in the psychology of learning

13. Training in student developmental needs

14. Training in nontraditional studies and delivery systems, such as community service, adult and continuing education

Organizational Development

15. Training in planning and decision-making

16. Training in management skills including efficiency techniques such as Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems (PPBS), Management Information Systems (MIS), Management by Objectives (MBO), etc.

17. Training in student assessment techniques

18. Training in team building, eg. ways of building effectiveness among a designated group of faculty

19. Training in conflict management, i.e., skills for the creative resolution of conflict

Note. Adapted from Criteria for the institutional evaluation of community college staff development programs (pp. 105-106) by S. Hekimian, 1984, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida. Copyright 1984 by S. Hekimian. Adapted by permission.

The criteria were organized into 2 questionnaires. One survey was directed toward part-time instructors. Those respondents identified faculty development activities that were available to them through their institution's staff development office during the 1982-83 and 1983-84 academic years. They also identified staff development activities in which they participated between August 1982 and August 1984. Responses were indicated by checks placed alongside each activity item. Respondents also rated the usefulness of each criterion based on a four-point Likert-type scale.

The second survey was directed toward the staff development directors at each of the three community colleges. The same criteria were used and their order duplicated that presented by Hekimian. Respondents marked those activities that were available to part-time instructors teaching credit courses and that were funded through their institution's staff development budget during the 1982-83 and 1983-84 academic years.

The questionnaires were pilot tested, revised, and distributed to 262 part-time instructors at Broward Community College, Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, and St. Johns River Community College. The part-time instructors surveyed had taught at least two terms during both 1982-83 and 1983-84. The three community colleges were selected based on their part-time faculty development activities, rural and urban differences, geographic differences, and proportional differences in the use of part-time instructors as compared to full-time instructors. Interest in participating in this study was another factor considered.

Questionnaires were also distributed to the staff development director at each of the community colleges following a pilot test of the instrument. Their responses were included in the analysis of data and permitted comparisons with selected responses by the part-time instructors.

The data were summarized using percentage terms and a tabular format. Comparisons were made using information provided by part-time instructors and staff development directors. Correlations were computed to determine the relationship between the part-time instructors' perceived needs and their levels of participation, as well as the relationship between their awareness of staff development activities and levels of participation. Results were significant at the .Ø5 level.

RESULTS

This study examined four dimensions of staff development training areas: instructional, personal, professional and organizational. These dimensions were related to part-time instructors' perceived needs, awareness of staff development offerings, and levels of participation in staff development training.

Research involved surveying selected part-time instructors and the staff development directors at three Florida community colleges. The part-time instructors included were those who were teaching at least one credit course during the Fall Semester of 1984, and who had taught credit courses for at least two terms during the academic years 1982-83 and 1983-84 each. A total of 262 questionnaires was distributed at Broward Community College, Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, and St. Johns River Community College. This study produced a response rate of 79 percent following the original distribution and 2 follow-ups of nonrespondents.

One hundred forty-six questionnaires were distributed to part-time instructors at Broward Community College. Seventy-eight percent were returned. Of those returned, 89 respondents met the specified criteria, and 86 questionnaires were usable. At Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, 86 questionnaires were distributed and 83 percent were returned. Of those returned, 68 questionnaires were usable.

Thirty questionnaires were distributed to part-time instructors at St. Johns River Community College. The criteria established for the other two community colleges were not applied at St. Johns River Community College because the population there was so low. As a result, only selected data related to St. Johns River Community College could be used in this research. Seventy-six percent of the questionnaires distributed at this college were returned, of which 21 questionnaires were usable.

The information was drawn from the responses provided in the staff development directors' survey. The data are summarized using percentage terms and a tabular format. Correlations were computed in questions 3 and 4. Results were significant at the .05 level.

Question 1

Were there differences between the available staff development training areas identified by staff development directors, and selected evaluative criteria developed by Hekimian?

This question sought to identify the available training areas based on 19 criteria selected from Hekimian's (1984) study. Appendix D provides a breakdown of the available faculty development areas at each community college, based on the responses of the respective staff development directors.

Florida Junior College at Jacksonville had the greatest diversity in its training areas, with a 63.2 percent match to Hekimian's criteria. Broward Community College's areas provided a 15.8 percent match. It should be noted that the staff development director at Broward Community College clarified that the training areas available to part-time instructors at his institution were primarily geared to those in the Allied Health department. St. Johns River Community College revealed a 10.5 percent match.

A closer look at the criteria categories revealed that only Florida Junior College at Jacksonville offered training for part-time faculty in all four of Hekimian's developmental categories (see Table 1). Instructional development was the only category common to all three community colleges. Broward Community College offered developmental opportunities in the instructional and professional areas; St. Johns River Community College offered opportunities in the instructional and personal areas.

Table 1

Percentage Ratings of Uniformity Within Hekimian's Developmental Categories

Criteria Category	BCC	FJC	SJRCC
Instructional Development	33.3%	66.6%	16.6%
Personal Development	0 %	80.0%	20.0%
Professional Development	33.3%	66.6%	0 %
Organizational Development	0 %	40.0%	0 %

It appeared that the three community colleges did not give equal attention to the four categories developed by Hekimian. One college gave considerably more attention to the categories, while the other two colleges gave less attention. When comparing the three community colleges, there was no pattern of commission or omission regarding the categories; all gave some attention to instructional development while two gave no attention at all to organizational development. The comprehensiveness of the activities offered through the staff development offices at the three community colleges was not uniform.

Question 2

Was there a relationship between the staff development needs of part-time instructors and the staff development training areas available to them?

The findings relevant for Question 2 are summarized in Appendix E. Responses from the part-time instructors at St. Johns River Community College were not included in answering this question because the number of the population examined was so low. Staff development needs at the other 2 institutions were determined from those instructors who considered each area to be of either "some use" or "much use."

Thirteen development areas that were unavailable to Broward Community College's part-time instructors were considered to be of either "some use" or "much use" by over 50 percent of the respondents from that community college. The areas were

Instructional:	Training in the understanding of the latest instructional trends (75.6 percent)
	Training in student self-instructional methods (56.6 percent)
	Training in multimedia approaches to instruction (68.7 percent)
	Training in the evaluation of instructional strategies (60.2 percent)
Personal:	Training in interpersonal skills, i.e., skills for dealing with others (60.2 percent)
	Training in personal growth and development (59 percent)
	Professional growth contracts, i.e., agreements by which faculty receive feedback on specified areas of instruction (71.1 percent)
	Individual counseling (53 percent)
Professional:	Training in the psychology of learning (59 percent)
Organizational:	Training in planning and decision-making (53.75 percent)
	Training in student assessment techniques (69.51 percent)
	Training in team building, eg. ways of building effectiveness among a designated group of faculty (53.7 percent)
	Training in conflict management, i.e., skills for the creative resolution of conflict (50.5 percent)

Three training areas were available to Broward Community College's part-time instructors during the 1982-83 and 1983-84 academic years. The part-time instructors responding to this survey all were members of the faculty during that time. Of the three training areas, over 50 percent of those surveyed indicated that they had current needs for such training.

Five training areas that were unavailable to part-time instructors at Florida Junior College at Jacksonville were identified as being needed by over 50 percent of the respondents from that institution. They were

Instructional:	Training in student self-instructional methods (54.5 percent)
	Training in the evaluation of instructional strategies (65.2 percent)
Personal:	Professional growth contracts, i.e., agreements by which faculty receive feedback on specified areas of instruction (65.7 percent)
Professional:	Training in the psychology of learning (60.6 percent)
Organizational:	Training in student assessment techniques (72.7 percent)

Seven other training areas, available to part-time instructors at Florida Junior College at Jacksonville during the period under study, were considered to be needed by over 50 percent of the respondents at that institution. They were

Instructional:	Training in the understanding of the latest instructional trends (89.7 percent)

	Training in the development of course objectives and course design (75.8 percent)
	Training in multimedia approaches to instruction (71.2 percent)
Personal:	Training in interpersonal skills, i.e., skills for dealing with others (55.2 percent)
	Training in personal growth and development (50.8 percent)
	Individual counseling (50 percent)
Professional:	Training in student developmental needs (64.2 percent)

Although seven training areas were available, over 50 percent of the part-time faculty at Florida Junior College at Jacksonville still needed training in these areas.

A comparison of both Broward Community College and Florida Junior College at Jacksonville revealed that there was almost no difference in the overall perceived needs among part-timers: 57.6 percent and 56.4 percent, respectively. Broward Community College offered only three training areas for its part-time instructors, while Florida Junior College at Jacksonville offered twelve. This indicated that the availability or unavailability of staff development training did not play a role in sensitizing instructors to their needs. One item was perceived to be the least needed by part-time instructors at both community colleges: "Training in health awareness"; it was available at one community college and unavailable at the other.

"Training in the latest instructional trends" was considered most needed by both groups of faculty. Over 75 percent of the respondents at both community colleges indicated a need for training in this area. The training was available at one institution and unavailable at the other. One other activity at Florida Junior College was needed by over 75 percent of the respondents: "Training in student assessment techniques." It was not available to the part-time instructors. In answer to Question 2, it appeared that 57.55 percent of part-time instructors at Broward Community College and 56.43 percent of those at Florida Junior College at Jacksonville had staff development needs that were not met.

Question 3

Was there a relationship between the perceived needs of the part-time instructors and their levels of participation in the staff development training areas?

Broward Community College offered development training in three areas to their part-time instructors. Florida Junior College at Jacksonville offered twelve training areas. Appendix F summarizes the perceived needs indicated by the part-time instructors and their levels of participation in the areas available at their respective institutions. Needs were determined by responses of either "some need" or "much need" on the survey.

The data revealed that over 50 percent of the responding part-time instructors at Broward Community College indicated a need for training in these areas. Participation levels among these same instructors ranged from 4.7 percent to 12.8 percent during the period under study. The area in which most part-time instructors at Broward Community College participated was "Training in the development of course objectives and course design" (12.8 percent). The area showing the least amount of participation was "Training in student developmental needs" (4.7 percent); yet that activity showed the highest need (63.9 percent).

With the exception of one activity, over 41 percent of the part-time instructors at Florida Junior College at Jacksonville indicated training needs in the available areas. Participation levels in these training areas ranged from 0 to 16.2 percent. The area in which most part-time faculty participated was "Training in multimedia approaches to instruction." None of the respondents participated in "Training in health awareness"; that area also showed the least indicated need.

To measure the strength of the relationship, the phi correlation coefficient was computed between the perceived needs and awareness of training areas. Needs were dichotomized so that responses 3 and 4 signified need (i.e., "Some Use" = 3; "Much Use" = 4), while responses of

1 and 2 signified no need (i.e., "No Use" = 1; "Little Use" = 2). Separate analyses were performed using Broward Community College and Florida Junior College at Jacksonville. Appendix G reports the correlations and probability levels.

At Broward Community College, a significant relationship appeared in one of the three available areas:

Instructional:	Training in the development of course objectives and course design (r = .21752)

An examination of the correlation coefficients revealed relationship between these variables in selected training areas at Florida Junior College at Jacksonville.

Personal:	Training in personal growth and development (r = .25746)
Organizational:	Training in management skills including efficiency techniques such as Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems (PPBS), Management Information Systems (MIS), Management by Objectives (MBO), etc. (r = .26474)

"Training in health awareness" showed a .Ø relationship because no part-time instructors participated in that training; it did not meet the criterion for statistical significance. In response to Question 3, there were significant relationships between the perceived needs of the part-time instructors and their levels of participation in selected staff development training areas. It was

evident that most part-time instructors believed they needed the training that was offered; yet few participated.

Question 4

Was there a relationship between part-time instructors' awareness of staff development training areas and their levels of participation?

Data relevant to this question are summarized in Appendix H. Of the three training areas available at Broward Community College during 1982-83 and 1983-84, the percentage of part-time instructors aware of their availability ranged from 16.3 to 24.4 percent, depending on the item. Levels of participation in the three training areas were lower: 4.7 to 12.8 percent. The area with the greatest amount of awareness (24.4 percent) and the highest level of participation (12.8 percent) was "Training in the development of course objectives and course design."

At Florida Junior College, 19.1 to 48.5 percent of the part-time instructors who responded were aware of the twelve training areas that were available to them; Ø to 16.2 percent participated, depending on the area. "Training in health awareness" showed the least amount of awareness (19.1 percent) and participation (Ø.Ø percent). The area with the highest awareness level was "Training in the latest instructional trends" (48.5 percent), but participation was low (11.8 percent).

To measure the strength of the relationship between the awareness of training areas and levels of participation among part-time instructors at Broward Community College and Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, phi correlations were computed (see Appendix I).

An examination of the correlation coefficients revealed significant relationships at Broward Community College in the following areas:

Instructional:	Training in the development of course design (r = .51169)
	Training in remedial and developmental techniques of instruction (r = .29424)

At Florida Junior College at Jacksonville there were four significant relationships:

Instructional:	Training in multimedia approaches to instruction (r = .42767)
Personal:	Training in personal growth and development (r = .27500)
Professional:	Training in nontraditional studies and delivery systems, such as community service, adult and continuing education (r = .37401)
Organizational:	Training in management skills including efficiency techniques such as Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems (PPBS), Management Information Systems (MIS), Management by Objectives (MBO), etc. (r = .24482)

The conclusion could be drawn that there is a tendency among part-time instructors to participate in training in

selected areas when they are aware of its availability. Staff development directors, then, should focus their efforts in making part-time instructors aware of the available training.

In response to Question 4, there appeared to be statistical relationships between the awareness and participation variables in regard to selected training areas. At both community colleges, there was a low awareness of available staff development activities, as well as a low level of participation.

Question 5

Were there differences between staff development training areas that part-time faculty believed were available to them and those training areas that actually were available to them, as indicated by staff development directors?

Appendix J presents the percentages of those responding part-time faculty who were aware of the availability of those training areas at their community college. The available areas were identified by each college's staff development director. At Broward Community College, the percentages of part-time faculty aware of the areas ranged from 16 to 24 percent. The awareness of part-time instructors at Florida Junior College at Jacksonville ranged from 19 to 48 percent. This institution, however, offered more staff development

training areas to part-time faculty than did the other two institutions. The awareness of St. Johns River Community College part-time instructors was 9.52 percent.

Findings further revealed that a number of part-time instructors at all three community colleges believed that faculty development activities were available to them when, according to the staff development directors, they were not. Appendix K identifies those training areas which were not available to part-time instructors, along with the percentages of those instructors who believed that those areas were available.

At Broward Community College, 9 to 31 percent of the part-time instructors surveyed thought that specific staff development training areas were available to them when actually those activities were not available. The percentage range at Florida Junior College at Jacksonville was higher: 19 to 45 percent believed training areas were available that were not. Part-time instructors at St. Johns River Community College provided a 4 to 28 percent range, which was the lowest of the 3 groups.

These findings indicated that over 75 percent of the part-time instructors at Broward Community College, over 50 percent of those at Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, and over 90 percent of those at St. Johns River Community College were not aware of the staff development training areas available to them. Additionally, many part-time

instructors believed that that some training areas were available to them through the staff development office, when they were not.

Question 6

Was there a relationship between the perceptions of part-time faculty and staff development directors regarding the staff development needs of part-time instructors?

Data used in answering this question are found in Appendix L. The staff development director at Broward Community College identified twelve training areas that would be of either "some use" or "much use" to the part-time instructors at his institution. Of those instructors responding, between 48 and 75 percent agreed that they needed training in the same twelve areas. Seven training areas were considered by the staff development director to be of "little use" or "no use" to part-time instructors. Over half of the responding part-time instructors at this community college perceived a need for training in five of the seven areas considered to be of little or no use by the staff development director. Those areas were

Personal:

Training in personal growth and development (59 percent)

Individual counseling (53 percent)

Organizational:	Training in planning and decision-making (53.8 percent)
	Training in team building, eg. ways of building effectiveness among a designated group of faculty (53.7 percent)
	Training in conflict management, i.e., skills for the creative resolution of conflict (50.6 percent).

The staff development director at Florida Junior College at Jacksonville regarded all 19 training areas to be of "some use" or "much use" to the part-time faculty at that institution. Between 24.62 and 89 percent of those part-time instructors who responded to that question perceived a need in those areas.

Seven training areas were perceived to be needed by over 60 percent of the respondents at Broward Community College (Appendix E). At Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, eight areas were perceived to be useful by over 60 percent of the part-time instructors. Seven identical training areas were identified as needed by part-time instructors at both community colleges. Instructors at Florida Junior College at Jacksonville identified one additional training need.

It appeared that at Broward Community College a discrepancy existed between the perceptions of the part-time faculty and the staff development director regarding training needs. Florida Junior College at

Jacksonville's staff development director and the part-time instructors are more aligned with their beliefs. Finally, seven identical training needs were identified by over 60 percent of the part-time instructors at both community colleges.

Question 7

Was there a relation between the perceived needs of the part-time instructors and their years of teaching experience?

Responses from part-time instructors at Broward Community College and Florida Junior College at Jacksonville were analyzed. Appendix M summarizes the percentages of those part-time instructors' perceived needs, based on their years of teaching experience. The needs were determined from the responses of part-time instructors regarding those staff development areas they considered to be either of "some use" or much use".

Those instructors at Broward Community College with teaching experience of 3 to 5 years indicated the greatest need for staff development training (64.2 percent). Instructors with 6 to 10 years experience indicated the next greatest need (63.9 percent), followed by those with 11 or more years (45.4 percent). The group of instructors with 0-2 years experience was not included in the analysis because so few fell into that category. This resulted from the criterion established earlier; instructors having

taught a minimum of four terms during two academic years were selected for the study. The analysis was based on item-by-item responses of part-time instructors whose numbers ranged from 76 to 79, depending on the item.

At Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, a similar pattern emerged. Those instructors with teaching experience of 3 to 5 years indicated the greatest need for training (66.4 percent). They were followed by those with 6 to 10 years experience (57 percent), and those with 11 or more years experience (50 percent). Percentages were determined from the responses of 64 to 68 part-time instructors on each of the nineteen items.

In comparing both community colleges, it appeared that part-time instructors with more than 10 years experience perceived a lower need for staff development activities than other instructors.

Question 8

Was there a relation between the perceived needs of the part-time instructors and their subject areas?

Based on the responses of the part-time instructors, eight subject areas were identified: Allied Health, Business Technologies, Communication, Criminal Justice, Distributive Education, Engineering Technologies, Math/Science/Recreation, and Social Science/Humanities. A review of the data revealed that many of these divisions had too few respondents to provide meaningful analysis and discussion.

At Broward Community College, four subject areas contained between 15 and 21 respondents. They were Allied Health, Business Technologies, Math/Science/Recreation, and Social Science/Humanities. Florida Junior College at Jacksonville had two subject areas containing between 13 and 19 respondents. They were Business Technologies and Social Science/Humanities. Appendices N and O summarize the findings based on these selected departments. The percentages were based on the responses of part-time instructors who indicated that the staff development training area was "some use" or "much use".

An average of 75.2 percent of the part-time instructors in the Allied Health area at Broward Community College indicated that they needed training in the areas identified in the questionnaire. This is the group at the college toward which most activities were directed. Other subject area needs were Social Science/Humanities (56.6 percent), Business Technologies (47.4 percent), and Math/Science/Recreation (45.7 percent). Part-time instructors in the Math/Science/Recreation area showed the least interest in training that directly related to the technology of teaching, i.e., remedial and developmental techniques of instruction, student self-instructional methods, psychology of learning, and non-traditional studies and delivery systems.

At Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, an average of 57.3 percent of the part-time instructors in the Business Technologies area indicated that they needed training in the areas identified in the questionnaire. In the Social Science/Humanities area, 50 percent noted their needs. Since the average percentages within the Business Technologies area and the Social Science/Humanities area at both community colleges were similar, a conclusion could be drawn that Math/Science/Recreation part-time instructors at other community colleges would also display low interest in training needs, as evidenced at Broward Community College.

A comparison of the Business Technologies part-time instructors at the 2 community colleges with the four staff developmental subcategories revealed few differences. Table 2 summarizes the results:

Table 2

Percentage of Part-time Instructors in the Business Technologies Area and Their Staff Development Needs: Broward Community College and Florida Junior College

Developmental Category	BCC	FJC
Instructional development	56.7	67.9
Personal development	44.0	45.7
Professional development	48.3	52.6
Organizational development	47.5	58.9

Similarly, a comparison of the part-time instructors in the Social Science/Humanities area, shown in Table 3, revealed little difference. In all categories, the needs of the part-time instructors at both community colleges varied slightly. Since the similarities are so strong at Broward Community College and Florida Junior College at Jacksonville within these two departments, a conclusion could be drawn that other alike departments at these institutions could also mirror the percentages of perceived needs.

Table 3

Percentage of Part-time Instructors in the Social Science/Humanities Area and Their Staff Development Needs: Broward Community College and Florida Junior College

Developmental Category	BCC	FJC
Instructional development	61.4	61.9
Personal development	46.4	42.0
Professional development	60.8	64.3
Organizational development	46.4	46.4

A closer examination of specific staff development needs, however, provided more information. Among the part-time instructors in Business Technologies at the two community colleges, a notable difference appeared in two criteria. Sixty-five percent of those from Broward Community College believed they needed "Training in the latest instructional trends", while 100 percent of Florida

Junior College at Jacksonville's part-time instructors indicated their need. Similarly, 45 percent of Broward's part-time instructors in the Business Technologies area believed they needed "Training in student assessment techniques", while 83 percent of FJC's instructors noted this need.

Among the Social Science/Humanities instructors, 56 percent at Broward and 85 percent at Florida Junior College at Jacksonville indicated the need for "Training in multimedia approaches to instruction". "Professional growth contracts" were perceived to be needed by 70 percent of Broward's instructors in this area, compared to 42 percent at FJC. Finally, 56 percent of Broward's instructors in this area perceived the need for "Training in planning and decision-making" to FJC's 14 percent.

There appeared little difference between the Business Technologies and Social Science/Humanities part-time instructors at Broward Community College and Florida Junior College at Jacksonville regarding their general needs, i.e., instructional, personal, professional and organizational development. Individual differences arose when specific training activities were compared within the departments discussed. Differences were also evident between subject areas at the two community colleges. Since these individual departments at both institutions reflected similar needs, a conclusion was drawn that part-time

instructors in departments of the same disciplines at these same institutions would mirror similar needs. Part-time instructors at Broward Community College in the Allied Health area showed the greatest need in the largest number of training areas. Again, this is the group of part-time instructors toward which staff development efforts are directed.

Conclusions and Discussion

The conclusions and discussion of this study were based upon the investigation of the following eight research questions:

1. Were there differences between available staff development training areas identified by staff development directors, and selected evaluative criteria developed by Hekimian?

The findings of the data analysis indicated that the comprehensiveness of the staff development offerings for part-time instructors was not uniform at the three community colleges. Instructional development was the only developmental category offered by all of the colleges.

It should be emphasized that the lack of comprehensiveness in staff development offerings among the community colleges should not be viewed negatively. Hekimian has noted that the criteria she developed are not absolute for any staff development program. Each community college should be allowed to determine program comprehensiveness based on the needs of its personnel.

2. Was there a relationship between the staff development needs of part-time instructors and the staff development training areas available to them?

Many instructors at Broward Community College and Florida Junior College at Jacksonville had training needs that were not met. At both colleges, part-time instructors indicated they still had needs in some areas where training had been available to them during the period under study; many indicated they had needs in areas where training had been unavailable to them. Concerning those who still had training needs following the two-year period when activities were available, it can be speculated that either the training sessions were not well attended by part-time instructors, or that the sessions were not thorough enough. Another reason simply may be the fact that many individuals recognized their continual need for upgrading and responded accordingly.

Part-time instructors at both colleges indicated the same level of need. Since Broward Community College offered fewer training areas than Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, a conclusion could be drawn that the availability or unavailability of training did not play a role in sensitizing instructors to their needs.

3. Was there a relationship between the perceived needs of the part-time instructors and their levels of participation in the staff development training areas?

In selected training areas, there were statistical relationships between the perceived needs and levels of participation among part-time instructors. Many part-time instructors believed they needed training in activities that had been available to them, yet they did not participate. The scheduling of the training activities perhaps was a factor in their nonattendance. Since most part-time instructors have other demands, finding a time to hold a staff development session is notoriously difficult, as noted earlier in the review of literature. Another problem could be communication. Perhaps part-time instructors were not receiving notices of the training sessions. Still another reason could be that part-time instructors did not place a high value on continuing education, unlike members of many other professions.

Conversely, the low participation could mean that those few part-time instructors were trying to make a good impression in an attempt to secure a full-time job. Another reason could be that the participants required licensure credits, such as instructors within the medical field. Lastly, participants might have placed a higher value on professional and personal growth than most other part-time instructors.

4. Was there a relationship between part-time instructors' awareness of staff development training areas and their levels of participation?

In selected training areas, there were statistical relationships between part-time instructors' awareness and their levels of participation. At Broward Community College and Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, there was an overall low awareness accompanied by even lower participation.

The staff development director at Florida Junior College offered a possible explanation for the low levels of awareness at that institution: the staff development office maintained a low profile throughout the college. It was not surprising, then, that employees were unaware of activities offered through the staff development office. Most employees probably believed that many activities were sponsored by other offices within Florida Junior College at Jacksonville. That explanation may also be the case at Broward Community College. Another reason could be a low level of communication regarding the available training.

5. Were there differences between staff development training areas that part-time faculty believed were available to them and those training areas that actually were available to them, as indicated by staff development directors?

Some part-time instructors at all three community colleges were not aware of many staff development activities that were indeed available to them. In several training areas, part-time instructors thought training was

available when it was not. These inaccurate perceptions may have resulted from a lack of internal communication within the institutions regarding staff development training. Another reason may be that these respondents did not want to appear unknowledgeable and provided positive answers to this questionnaire item.

6. Was there a relationship between the perceptions of part-time faculty and staff development directors regarding the staff development needs of part-time instructors?

At Broward Community College, the perceptions of the staff development director regarding the needs of part-time faculty was not in perfect alignment with the perceptions of that institution's part-time instructors. For instance, over 50 percent of the responding part-time instructors expressed training needs in five activities that the director though were not critically needed. In general, the perceptions of Florida Junior College's staff development director and part-time instructors were more in line than those individuals at Broward Community College. This may be misleading. The staff development director at Florida Junior College at Jacksonville responded that part-time instructors at that college needed training in all 19 areas, yet not all training areas were available to part-time instructors.

The critical point is that both staff development directors and part-time instructors regarded the same seven activities as most important, even though not all of those activities were available. In this regard, their thinking was aligned. Any limitations on the programs were likely to be the result of other factors, such as financial, instead of perceptual.

7. Was there a relationship between the perceived needs of the part-time instructors and their years of teaching experience?

At Broward Community College and Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, part-time instructors with more than 10 years of teaching experience did not indicate as great a need for staff development activities as did other groups. Instructors in the middle ranges (3 to 10 years of experience) indicated the greatest need. This interest in training may be due in part to feelings of stagnation and/or burnout. After several years of teaching, they may wish to update their classroom skills. Also, it may take a few years for an instructor to realize those areas which need development.

8. Was there a relationship between the perceived needs of the part-time instructors and their subject areas?

Differences were discernible between overall training needs and subject areas. There was consistency in two similar areas at Broward Community College and Florida

Junior College at Jacksonville. The conclusion could be drawn that other departments at other community colleges may be similar. It appeared, however, that there was little difference based on subject areas in the perceptions of part-time instructors regarding their categorical needs.

A comparison of part-time instructors' perceived needs with their subject areas was difficult because so many areas contained low numbers of respondents. Only selected areas at Broward Community College and Florida Junior College at Jacksonville could be examined. The comparison revealed that seventy-five percent of the part-time instructors in the Allied Health area at Broward Community College indicated training needs. This is the group toward which staff development efforts at Broward Community College are directed. This enthusiasm for training was matched neither by the other 3 departments at Broward Community College not the 2 departments at Florida Junior College at Jacksonville that were analyzed.

Recommendations

1. Community colleges should identify the needs of their part-time instructors and adjust the comprehensiveness of their staff development programs accordingly. Not all staff development programs need to provide training in all 19 areas discussed in this study. Assessments of part-time instructors' needs should help to discern the most critical training areas.

2. Training is especially needed for part-time instructors in the latest instructional trends.
3. Community colleges should take steps to ensure that part-time instructors are aware of staff development activities and are encouraged to participate. An investigation is needed at each college to determine the most effective methods of communication, i.e., handbooks, fliers, department meetings, to convey information about staff development activities. Appropriate scheduling is also a consideration.
4. Part-time instructors should be meaningfully involved in staff development activities. This should lead to training that is more applicable to their needs.
5. Staff development activities should be targeted especially at part-time instructors with 3 to 10 years teaching experience.
6. Staff development activities need to become more palatable to instructors with extensive teaching experience. Training should be designed to provide these instructors with a sense of involvement, respect, security, and recognition.

Implications

The results of this study indicate a need for research in the following areas:

1. The utilization of these criteria to examine the needs of part-time instructors in community colleges.

2. A replication of this study to involve other public community colleges, both those with and without formal staff development programs for part-time instructors.
3. A replication of this study in geographical areas dissimilar to Florida.
4. A replication of this study using age as a variable.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT FOR PART-TIME INSTRUCTORS

STAFF DEVELOPMENT SURVEY
FOR PART-TIME FACULTY

Instructional Department _____

Years of Teaching Experience: _____ 0 - 2 years

_____ 3 - 5 years

_____ 6 - 10 years

_____ 11+ years

1. In Column A, please check the faculty development activities that, to the best of your knowledge, have been available to you through your institution's staff development office during the 1982-83 and 1983-84 academic years.

   In Column B, please check only those activities in which you have participated between August 1982 and August 1984.

		Column A	Column B
a.	Training in the understanding of the latest instructional trends.	_____	_____
b.	Training in nontraditional studies and delivery systems	_____	_____
c.	Training in faculty, administrator and student assessment techniques	_____	_____
d.	Training in health awareness	_____	_____
e.	Training in the development of course objectives and course design.	_____	_____
f.	Training in student development needs	_____	_____
g.	Individual counseling	_____	_____
h.	Training in planning and decision-making	_____	_____
i.	Training in multi-media approaches to instruction	_____	_____
j.	Personal growth contracts	_____	_____

k.	Opportunities for professional upgrading renewal	_____	_____
l.	Training in remedial and developmental techniques of instruction.	_____	_____
m.	Training in the evaluation of instructional strategies	_____	_____
n.	Training in the psychology of learning	_____	_____
o.	Training in conflict management	_____	_____
p.	Training in self-instructional methods	_____	_____
q.	Training in interpersonal skills	_____	_____
r.	Training in management skills including efficiency techniques such as PPBS, MIS, MBO, etc.	_____	_____
s.	Training in personal growth and development	_____	_____
t.	Training in team building	_____	_____
u.	Other _____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____

2. How useful do you believe these same faculty development activities would be for you --(1) no use; (2) little use; (3) some use; (4) much use? (Circle one answer code number for each method.)

a.	Training in the understanding of the latest instructional trends.	1	2	3	4
b.	Training in nontraditional studies and delivery systems	1	2	3	4
c.	Training in faculty, administrator and student assessment techniques	1	2	3	4

d.	Training in health awareness	1	2	3	4
e.	Training in the development of course objectives and course design.	1	2	3	4
f.	Training in student development needs	1	2	3	4
g.	Individual counseling	1	2	3	4
h.	Training in planning and decision-making	1	2	3	4
i.	Training in multi-media approaches to instruction	1	2	3	4
j.	Personal growth contracts	1	2	3	4
k.	Opportunities for professional upgrading renewal	1	2	3	4
l.	Training in remedial and developmental techniques of instruction.	1	2	3	4
m.	Training in the evaluation of instructional strategies	1	2	3	4
n.	Training in the psychology of learning	1	2	3	4
o.	Training in conflict management	1	2	3	4
p.	Training in self-instructional methods	1	2	3	4
q.	Training in interpersonal skills	1	2	3	4
r.	Training in management skills including efficiency techniques such as PPBS, MIS, MBO, etc.	1	2	3	4
s.	Training in personal growth and development	1	2	3	4
t.	Training in team building	1	2	3	4
u.	Other _____	1	2	3	4
	_____	1	2	3	4
	_____	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT DIRECTORS

SURVEY FOR STAFF DEVELOPMENT DIRECTORS

NAME _____ INSTITUTION _____

Please check all staff development activities that were available to those part-time instructors teaching credit courses and that were funded through your institution's staff development budget during the 1982-83 and 1983-84 academic years.

a. Training in the understanding of the latest instructional trends _____

b. Training in the development of course objectives and course design _____

c. Training in remedial and development techniques of instruction _____

d. Training in self-instruction methods _____

e. Training in multi-media approaches to instruction _____

f. Training in the evaluation of instructional strategies _____

g. Training in interpersonal skills _____

h. Training in personal growth and development _____

i. Personal growth contracts _____

j. Individual counseling _____

k. Training in health awareness _____

l. Training in the psychology of learning _____

m. Training in student development needs _____

n. Training in nontraditional studies and delivery systems _____

o. Opportunities for professional upgrading and renewal _____

p. Training in planning and decision-making _____

q. Training in management skills including efficiency techniques such as PPBS, MIS, MBO, etc. _____

r. Training in faculty, administrator and student assessment techniques _____

s. Training in team building _____

t. Training in conflict management _____

u. Other _____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

2. How useful do you believe these same faculty development activities might be for the part-time instructors at your institution -- (1) no use; (2) little use; (3) some use; (4) much use? (Circle one answer code number for each method.)

a.	Training in the understanding of the latest instructional trends.	1	2	3	4
b.	Training in nontraditional studies and delivery systems	1	2	3	4
c.	Training in faculty, administrator and student assessment techniques	1	2	3	4
d.	Training in health awareness	1	2	3	4
e.	Training in the development of course objectives and course design.	1	2	3	4
f.	Training in student development needs	1	2	3	4
g.	Individual counseling	1	2	3	4
h.	Training in planning and decision-making	1	2	3	4
i.	Training in multi-media approaches to instruction	1	2	3	4
j.	Personal growth contracts	1	2	3	4
k.	Opportunities for professional upgrading renewal	1	2	3	4

l.	Training in remedial and developmental techniques of instruction.	1	2	3	4
m.	Training in the evaluation of instructional strategies	1	2	3	4
n.	Training in the psychology of learning	1	2	3	4
o.	Training in conflict management	1	2	3	4
p.	Training in self-instructional methods	1	2	3	4
q.	Training in interpersonal skills	1	2	3	4
r.	Training in management skills including efficiency techniques such as PPBS, MIS, MBO, etc.	1	2	3	4
s.	Training in personal growth and development	1	2	3	4
t.	Training in team building	1	2	3	4
u.	Other _____	1	2	3	4
	_____	1	2	3	4
	_____	1	2	3	4

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE BY (give date 10 days from date of letter) to Ms. Ann Marie Byrd, 305-02 Diamond Village, Gainesville, FL 32603.

REFERENCES

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1978). 1978 community, junior, and technical college directory. Washington, DC: AACJC.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1984). 1984 community, junior, and technical college directory. Washington, DC: AACJC.

Behm, R., Lybarger, A., Toole, H., & Wilbur, R. (1977). Accentuating the professional role of part-time faculty. Unpublished paper. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 143 401)

Bender, L.W., & Hammons, J.O. (1972). Adjunct faculty: Forgotten and neglected. Community and Junior College Journal, 43(2), 20-22.

Bergquist, W.H., & Phillips, S.R. (1975). Components of an effective faculty development program. Journal of Higher Education, 46, 177-211.

Black, L.K. (1981). Part-time community college faculty: Their needs for instruction-related assistance. Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 5, 275-285.

Centra, J. (1976). Faculty development practices in U.S. colleges and universities. Princeton: Educational Testing Service.

Cohen, A.M., & Brawer, F.B. (1977). The two-year college instructor today. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Elioff, I., Whitmore, L.A., & Bagwell, R. (1981). Faculty development for part-timers: First annual report, September 1, 1980 to August 31, 1981. Berkeley, CA: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 216 737)

Friedlander, J. (1980). Instructional practices of part-time faculty. In M.H. Parsons (Ed.), New directions for community colleges: No. 30. Using part-time faculty effectively (pp. 27-36). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gaff, J.G. (1975). Toward faculty renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Group for Human Development in Higher Education. (1974). Faculty development in a time of retrenchment. New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press.

Hammons, J.O. (1973). Suggestions concerning institutional training of new faculty. Community College Review, 1(2), 49-60.

Hammons, J. O. (1981). Adjunct faculty: Another look. Community College Frontiers, 9,(2), 46-54.

Hekimian, S. (1984). Criteria for the institutional evaluation of community college staff development programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida.

Hoenniger, R., & Black, R.A. (1978). Neglect of a species. Community and Junior College Journal, 49(3), 25-27.

Leslie, D.W., Kellams, S.W., & Gunne, G.M. (1982). Part-time faculty in American higher education. New York: Praeger.

Lombardi, J. (1975). Part-time faculty in community colleges (Topical Paper No. 54). Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 115 316)

Moe, J. (1977). A staff development model for part-time instructors. In T. O'Banion (Ed.), New directions for community colleges: No. 19. Developing staff potential (pp. 35-46). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Banion, T. (1974). Staff development: A priority on persons. In R. Yarrington (Ed.), New staff for new students: Educational opportunity for all (pp. 23-40). Report of the 1973 Assembly of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Washington, DC: AACJC.

Pedras, M.J. (1984). The conceptualization and development of a staff development model for community college part-time faculty. Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 2023A. (University Microfilms No. DA83-25,598)

Pierce, H.B., & Miller, R.T. (1980). Burlington County College: Development program for adjunct faculty. In M.H. Parsons (Ed.), New directions for community colleges: No. 30. Using part-time faculty effectively (pp. 37-45). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Russell, W.H. (1980). Characteristics and educational needs of the part-time faculties at selected Florida community/junior colleges. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 4373A. (University Microfilm No. 80-02,895)

Seitz, J.E. (1972). Professional orientations and attitudes of part-time junior college faculty. Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 4996A. (University Microfilms No. 72-10,298)

Smith, A. (1981). Staff development goals and practices in U.S. community colleges. Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 5, 209-225.

Smith, R.R. (1980). Can participatory programs realize part-time faculty potential? In M.H. Parsons (Ed.), New directions for community colleges: No. 30. Using part-time faculty effectively (pp. 17-26). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

State Board of Community Colleges. (1984). Standards: Part-time Faculty. Approved at April 6, 1984 meeting.

Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. (1984). Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of American higher education. The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 24, 1984, pp. 35-49.

Tuckman, H.P., & Caldwell, J. (1979). The reward structure for part-timers in academe. Journal of Higher Education, 50, 745-760.

Turner, M.A. (1980). A study of perceived problems resulting from the use of part-time faculty members in five selected community colleges in Florida (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 3825A.

Weichenthal, P.B., Means, R.P., & Kozoll, C.E. (1977). Professional development handbook for community college part-time faculty members. Urbana: College of Education and Office of Continuing Education and Public Services, University of Illinois. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 156 288)

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE
FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES

MAR 14 1986